

here with a concept to make Government more efficient. I think they deserve tremendous credit for that.

Then I hear the pundits and a lot of critics out there saying, well, Congress can never balance its budget because of entitlements and because of interest payments and various reasons. I say that is absolutely wrong.

I come from Delaware, and for 8 years Pete du Pont was Governor of Delaware. He was the one who made up his mind that we could balance the budget in Delaware. We had not done that, and then we did it. I was Governor for 8 years, during that period of time, and it continued on with Tom Carper, the Democratic Governor of the State of Delaware. We not only balanced our budget; we have had a series of tax cuts, and we have two rainy day funds on top of each other. We take care of almost every possibility in terms of being able to keep in balance from year to year, and I am absolutely convinced that it can be done.

I would tell my colleagues that there is a lot of protection, not just in this Congress, but by constituent groups on the outside, and particularly by the press, who try to protect the status quo. They do not welcome true innovation or change.

In just one area of tremendous concern, people will say to us, why do not you cut your salaries, and you can balance the budget? That is 100th of 1 percent of the budget. Or cut foreign aid. That is a small percent.

But get into Medicaid and Medicare, which is the fastest growing segment of the budget, 17 or 18 percent collectively between them now in the budget of the United States, and there is an area which has grown from zero about 30 years ago to where it is today, which is growing faster than everything else which we need to address.

□ 1730

I do not know of any Member of Congress, if these seats were all filled, who would not say "I want health care for the poor and I want health care for our senior citizens." We all feel that way.

So the question is, how can you reduce those expenditures in those particular programs but still provide the health care. There is a very simple lesson. Look at today's newspapers. Today's newspapers brought us the news that there was a slight increase in the cost of health care to the private insurers last year. I think it was about 2 percent or something. When you had HMOs, it was actually a decrease in the amount they spent. When you had regular health care, it increased by about 2.5 percent or something of that nature. Yet, we have these Government programs which are still going up at the rates of 10 percent or 11 percent or 12 percent. That is well beyond population growth.

The truth of the matter is that we deliver health care at the Government level exactly the way we have done all along, and perhaps we should innovate.

There are innovations out there. There are HMO's. The medisave account is something which could work. We do not know that for sure. But if you are doing what some people have talked about doing here, I am sure they are going to cut into health care, and they might do some of the things you are talking about.

You can get your prescription eyeglasses, perhaps, or your pharmaceuticals which you need as part of the plan you get into because we let people expand and go to a market-based system. I am convinced we can do this same thing with welfare. We have done this in Delaware. We have basically told people they have to start going to school, that they had to get a job after a period of time. They started going to school.

I thought it was going to be a very difficult thing to do. We went down and visited these people, and they were perhaps the most contented citizens I visited in the whole time I was Governor. They were being given an opportunity. One-third of those people are working today, and one-third are off of welfare altogether as a result of that. That is a pretty good result. I would like it to be a 100 percent, we all would, but that is a pretty doggone good result.

But I think there are ways in which we can come up with creative and good opportunities for people to improve their lives and still provide the same services we have today, but do them in a different way, and balance our budget. Yes, we have to work at it, but there are a lot of experts in this room. I think given that opportunity, that could happen, and we could really do what we have to do, which is to balance the budget in 7 years. It is tough, but is not impossible. We should be doing it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line to this is that people have said, "Well, we got into this over 30 years. It should take us 30 years." No, we got into debt in 1 year. We are not looking to pay back the debt. We were simply saying, "Let us not make the debt any larger." So we have a 7-year plan. Frankly, a number of us here have said, "Let us balance the budget sooner with no tax cut," but the issue is ultimately balancing the budget, getting our financial house in order.

Mr. Speaker, we are not paying back that debt, we are simply saying, "Let us not make the debt any larger." When you talk about the innovation, we have seen extraordinary innovation on the State level. You were a Governor for 8 years. I can remember that we looked at how you did it when we were in the State of Connecticut, because Delaware was doing innovative programs. We looked at what Tennessee is doing and what Arizona is doing with managed health care for nursing care and so on.

Why is it that the working American basically is under managed care, but the elderly, who are under taxpayer expense, and the poor, who are under tax-

payer expense, are under the traditional old system of fee-for-service? We are still going to allow them to have fee-for-service, but we are eager to encourage them to get into plans that save money and are more efficient and provide better service.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about a lot of issues, and we are basically, I think, running out of time in the next few minutes. We have about 3 minutes. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I would just like to make this point, Mr. Speaker. As I look at my State of Michigan, a few years ago we had a debt of about almost \$2 billion, which is a lot for any State. Our Governor and our legislature went after spending, tightened everybody's belts. Today they have cut taxes 23 times in the last 3 years. We can do the same here, but we have to focus on the spending side. We have to do something about deficits that average somewhere between \$150 billion and \$250 billion over the last couple years, and we have to do it together. That means this side of the aisle and this side of the aisle working together to get the job done, and really get the budget balanced.

Mr. CASTLE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, just briefly, I could not agree with the gentleman more. I worry a little bit when I read in the press that some of the leadership here in both houses and even the White House are beginning to say, "I do not think we can get to a balanced budget." I certainly have not given up on that. I think this is the time to do it.

People do not realize how close we are. We have really narrowed the differences. Yes, there are some policy differences that need to be resolved as well, but from a numbers point of view, we are as close as they have ever been to do this. I think to give up on it now would be a huge mistake. I hope we push hard in the remaining weeks of this spring and hopefully get this done sometime before we go too much further into the fiscal year.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank my colleague for making this point. The bottom line is we have an extraordinary opportunity. We want to seize this opportunity and we want to work together with the President, who came in with a very conciliatory message, I thought, and with our colleagues on the other side. But we want them to be real numbers, we want there to be structural change in the program. We want to save this country for future generations.

#### IMPLICATIONS OF FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TESTING NIGHTMARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 29, 3 short days before he is to arrive in Washington,

President Chirac of France announced, in a formal news release, the end to nuclear testing in the South Pacific. Though he makes a pretty speech, just in time to come to Washington as a fervent advocate of nuclear disarmament and to establish warm ties with America, I want to point out for my colleagues and to the American people, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of Chirac's recent piece of propaganda.

Mr. Chirac began his news release with these words:

Dear compatriots, I announce to you today the final end to French nuclear tests. Thanks to the final series that has just taken place, France will have a durable, reliable, and modern defense.

Point No. 1, Mr. Speaker, France already has the world's fourth largest Navy and the world's third largest stockpile of nuclear weapons before it even began its final series of nuclear tests. France had already exploded over 200 nuclear bombs in land, air, and water, far from the home of the enlightenment. In particular, France had already exploded 178 nuclear bombs in the South Pacific. Were those 200-plus nuclear bomb explosions not enough to ensure a durable, reliable, and modern defense? If those 200 were not enough, why should we now believe that the 6 additional nuclear bomb explosions France has just conducted in the South Pacific would be enough to stay its appetite for an even more modern defense?

Point No. 2: The final series of French nuclear tests were not even necessary. The United States freely offered France the technology it sought to ensure its so-called nuclear weapons reliability. Why did France not accept the United States offer? Because of a combination of two things: French national pride, and French suspicions that the United States was withholding state-of-the-art technology.

Now Chirac wants to be perceived as promoting nuclear disarmament and warm ties with America? One who defiantly violates world moratoriums and resumes unnecessary nuclear testings cannot and must not be regarded as a promoter of nuclear disarmament, and one who is suspicious of any offerings the United States might make certainly cannot be regarded as one who is promoting warm ties with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac continues his speech by saying: "The security of our country and our children is assured." In turn, Mr. Speaker, I say "At what price, and whose children?" The sixth nuclear bomb that France exploded on Saturday, last Saturday, since violating the world's moratorium, was six times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan; a bomb, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that took the immediate lives of some 150,000 people, and later claimed another 50,000 who died from nuclear contamination and illnesses.

In response to France's latest nuclear explosion in Fangataufa Atoll, the

mayor of Hiroshima said these words: "I feel renewed anger. Nuclear tests aimed at developing and maintaining nuclear technology will do nothing but increase the risk of putting human beings on the brink of ruin."

I might now ask, Mr. Speaker, what kind of security has France really secured for our children? The Pacific Ocean covers one-third of the world's surface. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that France has put not only its children but all of our children on the brink of ruin by exposing them to nuclear contamination through a resulting toxic food chain.

Mr. Speaker, Chirac's reckless actions have initiated the nuclear arms race all over again. Horrific environmental concerns aside, Chirac's decision to resume unnecessary nuclear testings in the South Pacific has opened a Pandora's box that holds chilling implications for nuclear and nonnuclear nations alike. Prime Minister Keating of Australia recently said, and I quote:

The French government is to be strongly condemned for the latest test at Fangataufa Atoll, and for conducting it during negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which are now entering the final critical stages in Geneva, Switzerland.

What implications, Mr. Speaker, does Chirac's reckless decision to initiate the nuclear arms race all over again hold for those negotiations and for the security of the world? Let me share with you, Mr. Speaker, the domino effect of Chirac's reckless decision. These is now a serious move by India to link the negotiations of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in Geneva to its call for negotiations to start this year on removing all nuclear weapons in a specified time. The five nuclear superpowers are, of course, against this move, but joining India is, ironically, Pakistan.

Adding to this difficulty, India refuses to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the basis that the nuclear nations are still maintaining their nuclear arsenals, which in effect make the whole treaty meaningless and discriminatory. India's Prime Minister has said and I quote: "We are of the view that to be meaningful, the treaty should be securely anchored in a global disarmament context, and be linked through treaty language to the elimination of all nuclear weapons in a time-bound framework." In other words, Mr. Speaker, India is pushing for no loopholes in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

As it currently stands, what assurances do nonnuclear nations have if nuclear nations retain their nuclear arsenals? If France's resumption of nuclear tests in the South Pacific is a case in point, nonnuclear nations have next to nothing in assurances from a five-member club comprised of one who is willing to defy world moratoriums at will, and four who are willing to act in complicity by looking the other way.

Mr. Speaker, because of Chirac's reckless and selfish decision, India is

now ignoring Western pressure to scrap its ambitious ballistic missile program. India is saying. If France can defy world moratoriums to ensure a durable, reliable, and modern defense, then so can we. Just this week India successfully launched a new ballistic missile, the Prithvi, that has a range exceeding 150 miles and a capability of being fitted with nuclear warheads.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that India has a missile with nuclear capabilities that can reach the capital of Pakistan, Islamabad, so now Pakistan wants to utilize M-11 ballistic missiles from China. These M-11 missiles are also capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and they could hit key cities throughout India.

But the chain reaction Chirac has created does not stop there, Mr. Speaker. India and China have just signed a mutual contract for India to purchase uranium from China. Now China, in an expression of its own security concerns, is developing warm relations with Russia. China's position is that you cannot depend on Western powers for its security. Now there is renewed apprehension between Russia and the NATO powers. All of this, Mr. Speaker, is a result of the fear France has created and fueled by its defiance in violation of the world moratorium to stop nuclear testing.

Australian Prime Minister Keating sums it up this way: "Such irresponsible actions send the worst possible signal to nations that aspire to possess nuclear weapons. The French government is to be strongly condemned."

Despite world condemnation, Mr. Speaker, Chirac arrogantly continues his speech of Eurocentric rationale by marginalizing Asian Pacific concerns.

President Chirac state: "I know the decision I took last June may have caused worries and emotions." Mr. Speaker, can you believe this? Chirac thinks his decision only caused "worries and emotions". Is he still denying the environmental effects of his unnecessary nuclear bomb explosions in waters conveniently located halfway around the world from France? Is he still claiming that his nuclear bomb explosions have no ecological consequences?

Is he unaware that he has initiated a nuclear arms race all over again? Or does he just take nuclear proliferation lightly, suggesting that it should cause nothing more than a few worries and emotions? What kind of world leader could be so barbaric in his interpretations, Mr. Speaker?

President Chirac continues by claiming that, "While my resolve was not affected, I was not insensitive to those movements of public opinion." How sensitive, Mr. Speaker, was he? Was he sensitive enough to stop nuclear bombings? Was he sensitive enough to consider the 28 million people living in the Pacific region whose lives will be affected for decades to come as a result of the nuclear nightmare Chirac's unaffected resolve created for them?

□ 1745

As Prime Minister Bolger of New Zealand has noted, and I quote:

Despite all suggestions from France that this is a totally safe and benign operation, there is no such thing as a safe nuclear test. They all create massive damage. It is just a matter of how much, when, and what leakage there is.

Philippines President Ramos also has this to say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote once again:

I condemn in the strongest terms the latest tests by France. This latest test is a continued defiance of the international communities' appeals to France.

Mr. Speaker, I might also note, this latest test comes shortly after all 10 Southeast Asian countries signed a treaty providing for a nuclear-free zone in that part of the world.

While President Chirac may claim sensitivity, the latest in French nuclear testings are an affront, a slap in the face, to Asia-Pacific countries. Since when is a slap in the face, Mr. Speaker, considered to be an expression of sensitivity?

Promoting his propaganda to the hilt, Mr. Speaker, Chirac continues his response to the world's condemnation of French nuclear testings. These movements, as Chirac likes to call what have really been international, "testified," he says, "to the growing importance the world's inhabitants attach to collective security and safeguarding the environment. I share these concerns."

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that the world's No. 1 nuclear proliferator, the man responsible for initiating the nuclear arms race all over again, would now try to convince us that he shares our concerns for collective security and safeguarding of the environment. If this were the case, why did he not just accept the technology the United States offered?

Why conduct unnecessary nuclear testing? Why reopen the nuclear arms race? Why create the paranoia? Why pit nuclear nations against non-nuclear nations? Why pit Western powers against non-Western powers? Why, on the one hand, claim that there are no ecological consequences of nuclear testings, but on the other hand, choose to conduct these nuclear tests far from the borders of France?

Whose environment is Chirac really interested in safeguarding, Mr. Speaker? And whose security is he really concerned about?

In a very patronizing way, Mr. Speaker, Chirac also said, and I quote:

I know that nuclear energy can be frightening, but in a world that is still dangerous, our weapon is a deterrent—that means a weapon that can serve peace. Today I have the feeling of having accomplished one of my most important duties by giving France, for decades to come, the capability for its independence and security.

I think that answers in question for us, Mr. Speaker. It is French security and the French environment that Chirac is concerned about. To heck with everyone else's independence and security. France has its own rules.

France does its own thing. If it wants to violate world moratoriums, it will. France, after all, comes first.

Mr. Speaker, excuse me, but I thought peace meant working together to create an equitable environment for all citizens of the world not just French ones. While I am on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I might question Chirac's use of the word "independence." Does "independence" in Chirac's vocabulary include freedom for the native people of Tahiti who have felt the brunt of French colonial reign since the islands of French Polynesia were what Westerners would call "colonized" by France, after some 500 French soldiers with guns and cannons subdued the Tahitian chiefs and their warriors in the 1840's. Or is independence just a concept, like security, that Chirac applies only to the people of France?

Mr. Speaker, Chirac continues his dramatic monolog by saying, and I quote:

A new chapter is opening. France will play an active and determined role in world disarmament and for a better European defense.

Mr. Speaker, do I hear Chirac correctly? Do I hear him trying to justify his latest nuclear testings by saying he did it all to stabilize relations in Europe?

For him to suggest that the resumption of French nuclear testing was done to stabilize relations in Europe is ridiculous. When France first presented the idea that in an effort of concerted deterrence it would extend its nuclear umbrella to its European partners, there were few takers, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 10 of the 15 European Union members voted with the United Nations, protesting the resumption of French nuclear testing.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are not the European Union members more anxious to be a part of the French nuclear umbrella? Partly because the European Union members are more comfortable with the protection the United States has provided them for the past 50 years, and partly, Mr. Speaker, because historically, France just cannot be trusted.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1940's, France surrendered to Nazi Germany. In 1966, at the height of the cold war, when nuclear missiles were pointed at every major country in Europe, France pulled out of the NATO alliance. Today France still has not officially joined NATO, and as we have clearly seen, from September of 1995 to January of this year, France cannot even be trusted to honor a world moratorium it agreed to only 4 short years ago. How can any nation, European or not, be assured of any French position?

Mr. Speaker, Chirac says, and I quote:

I will take initiatives in this direction in the coming weeks. As all of you, dear patriots, I want peace—solid and durable peace. We all know that peace, like freedom, has to be built each day. This is the purpose of the decision I took and that will be the guideline for my action tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, can we really put stock in Chirac's guideline for tomorrow?

France's own Urban Minister said about Chirac's decision to explode eight additional bombs in the South Pacific, and I quote, "He did what he said he would do and he did the right thing."

Mr. Speaker, something is rotten in Denmark when world leaders consider that they have done the right thing by violating world moratoriums that they agreed to. Chirac's aide said Chirac will earn international respect for sticking determinatively to a decision almost as unpopular domestically as it was internationally.

Mr. Speaker, if the responses of world leaders from Australia, New Zealand, Japan, the Philippines, the Pacific nations and Europe is any indication of international sentiment, Chirac will be a long time in earning anybody's respect. Anyone with a social conscience, world leader or not, knows that the only interest Chirac considered in resuming nuclear testings was the higher interests of French military industrial lobbyists and their profitable \$2.5 billion nuclear program.

Mr. Speaker, now Chirac wants to come to Washington and make a case for peach and act as a spokesperson for the world's poor. But, Mr. Speaker, did you know that France is now the top weapons exporter of weapons supplier in the world?

Mr. Speaker, is it with irony or with hypocrisy that President Chirac will promote peach and act as a spokesman for the world's poor when France is the biggest exporter of weapons to developing nations?

Mr. Speaker, while Chirac may script his story for Eurocentric audiences, the people of the Pacific who feel the brunt of colonial reign have their own story to tell. It is a travesty that on Thursday their voices will be made mute in this Chamber by one who so arrogantly and so openly marginalizes not only their concerns, but the concerns of the world community as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is an act devoid of all social conscience that has afforded Mr. Chirac the opportunity of delivering his downright deceptive message from a Chamber that symbolically represents the highest of democratic values. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join together in insisting that the Speaker rescind the invitation he has extended to Mr. Chirac, and if the invitation is not revoked, then I urge my colleagues not to attend the Joint session of Congress.

To attend the session is to act in complicity, to validate France's position that it is okay to violate world moratoriums, to resume nuclear testings, to initiate a nuclear arms race all over again, to place humanity on the brink of destruction.

As a Member of both the Pacific Island community and the U.S. House of Representatives, and as one who has sailed to the nuclear testing site of Mururoa and been arrested at the

hands of French commandos in waters the good Lord gave the people of Polynesia, as one who has considered the kind of world that I want my children to live in, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience be a party to such hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1996]

# CHIRAC ENDS FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TEST PROGRAM

(By William Drozdiak)

PARIS, JANUARY 29.—President Jacques Chirac announced tonight that France has ended its controversial nuclear testing program in the South Pacific and will not embark on a fresh campaign in favor of disarmament.

In a televised statement, Chirac said he decided to halt all further nuclear tests because France can now be assured to a "modern and secure" arsenal as a result of data gleaned from six underground blasts conducted over the past five months.

"A new chapter is opening. France will play an active and determined role for disarmament in the world and for a better European defense," he declared. "I will take initiatives in this direction in the coming weeks."

The French decision means China is the world's only declared nuclear power that still insists on the right to carry out weapons tests. Others, including the United States, have joined a moratorium while negotiations proceed on a worldwide nuclear test ban treaty.

The Clinton administration hailed Chirac's decision and predicted it will add momentum to the treaty talks.

"The United States has consistently urged that all nations abide by a global moratorium on nuclear testing as we work to complete and sign a comprehensive test ban treaty," the White House said in a statement.

Under President Francois Mitterrand, France had abstained from testing for three years. Chirac's decision last June, shortly after he took office, to resume testing sparked worldwide protests and contributed to a sharp drop in his popularity at home. He insisted that the tests were necessary to verify a new warhead for France's submarine-based missiles and to perfect computer-based simulation technology that would be employed once a test ban was imposed.

The announcement that France is rejoining the moratorium came two days after the final blast, described as "less than 120 kilotons," or six times the size of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, was conducted at the Fangataufa coral atoll about 750 miles southeast of Tahiti.

Chirac acknowledged that he was "not insensitive" to the fear and consternation provoked at home and abroad by the resumption of France's underground nuclear explosions. Despite what he called the "frightening" power of nuclear bombs and threats to the environment, he insisted that France's arsenal will "serve the interests of peace."

Chirac plans to make a state visit this week to Washington, where he will make a speech before both houses of Congress. He is expected to use the occasion to launch a diplomatic counteroffensive, promoting the virtues of the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty being negotiated in Geneva.

French officials said Chirac also plans to co-chair an international conference on nuclear security in Moscow in April. The meeting, which will review safety problems at nuclear power stations, was conceived by the leaders of the world's major industrial democracies last year to prevent disasters such

as the Chernobyl nuclear accident a decade ago.

With the South Pacific testing ground now due to be closed, the French president reportedly will announce an aid package Tuesday to help compensate French Polynesia for the loss of lucrative earnings from the nuclear testing center.

Chirac said France can afford to stop its program well ahead of schedule—and two tests short of the eight he originally planned—because he is satisfied that results already obtained have fulfilled the programs' objectives.

But it was clear that the surprising ferocity of global opposition to the French program hastened its conclusion.

Japan, Australia and New Zealand have waged a vociferous protest campaign since the tests started last September. A consumer boycott of French exports was launched in many countries, though the government here claims it did not inflict as much damage as initially feared on the French wine, perfume and clothing industries.

Chirac contends that what wounded him most was the lack of solidarity from many of France's European Union partners, even after he suggested the arsenal could serve as a strategic shield for a future European defense community.

Among the EU's 15 member nations, only Britain offered public support for the French nuclear tests. Germany and Spain remained mute out of deference to dismay among their citizens, while governments in the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries were overtly hostile to the French program.

Now that the tests are concluded, however, Chirac gave notice that he intends to emphasize the fight against nuclear proliferation by pushing hard for a comprehensive test ban treaty by the end of this year. Seeking to curtail the hostility of protests abroad, France insisted several months ago that the treaty should embrace the "zero option" banning all tests, even those of the smallest explosive power.

Some military experts, notably in the Pentagon, wanted to set the ban at a certain threshold to preserve the right to carry out micro-explosions, ostensibly to ensure the reliability of existing arsenals.

After some hesitation, the United States and Britain endorsed the zero option now backed by Chirac. But Russia and China have not accepted the proposal. While Russia has stopped testing, the Chinese insist on the right to continue underground explosions because they contend their program lags far behind those of the other nuclear powers.

Besides the continuing dispute over the zero option, negotiations for a test ban treaty now unfolding in Geneva have encountered problems from other countries that may aspire to join the nuclear club.

India has predicated its support for a test ban treaty on a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear arsenals in the world, a hard-line position that if sustained could torpedo the negotiations.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 30, 1996]

# CHIRAC ENDS NUCLEAR TESTS ON EVE OF STATE VISIT

French President Jacques Chirac yesterday ended a series of underground nuclear tests in the South Pacific that were threatening to create a major embarrassment during his state visit to Washington this week.

Several members of Congress have threatened to boycott Mr. Chirac's address to a joint session on Thursday and have asked House Speaker Newt Gingrich to withdraw the invitation, according to the Capitol Hill newspaper Roll Call.

In Paris, Mr. Chirac announced that with the completion of the sixth and most power-

ful blast on Saturday, France had achieved its objective of ensuring a "viable and modern defense." He said he was calling for "a definitive halt to French nuclear tests."

"I know that the decision that I made last June may have provoked, in France and abroad, anxiety and emotion," Mr. Chirac said on state-run television last night.

"I know that nuclear weaponry may cause fear. But in an always-dangerous world, it acts for us as a weapon of dissuasion, a weapon in the service of peace."

The announcement came just days before Mr. Chirac's state visit, which was postponed from last fall.

Roll Call reported that several Democratic members of Congress last week condemned the decision to invite the French president to address a joint session and called on Mr. Gingrich to rescind the invitation.

A spokesman for the Senate historian's office called the protest, led by representatives from Hawaii and the Pacific territories, "extraordinary" and said he could not recall a similar outcry in the past.

Roll Call quoted the representatives describing Mr. Chirac's appearance as a "direct affront against the United States and its people and of the world."

They urged fellow House members in a "Dear Colleague" letter to "protest President Chirac's wanton disregard of the appeals by and on behalf of the people of the Pacific region" for an end to the tests.

There was little chance of the address being canceled, but a top Democratic leadership aide told Roll Call the event could end up as nothing more than a "joint session to staffers and pages." Mr. Gingrich might have to "hustle to fill the room," the aide said.

France began the tests with a Sept. 5 blast beneath Mururoa Atoll. That detonation, roughly the size of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945, broke a three-year international moratorium on nuclear testing.

It made France the only nation besides China to test weapons of mass destruction since 1992. France insisted it had to resume the tests to check its nuclear arsenal and develop computer simulation that will make actual detonations unnecessary in the future.

The testing outraged Australia, New Zealand and other South Pacific countries and provoked rioting in Tahiti. But it did not elicit strong response from such major French allies as the United States, Britain and Germany.

The environmental group Greenpeace, which fought the tests with bitter denunciations and high-seas protests, expressed relief at Mr. Chirac's decision.

"France has finally bowed to international pressure," said Josh Handler, the group's disarmament coordinator. Greenpeace said it would now press France to return protest ships seized over the past few months.

On Oct. 20, France, Britain and the United States jointly announced they would sign a treaty making the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone after the final French test.

White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry predicted that Paris' decision "will provide new momentum" to efforts to reach a test-ban treaty. The United States had pressed France to abide by the global moratorium.

In France, too, pressure had mounted on the conservative president to make Saturday's test the last. French trade in the South Pacific lost some ground, and Paris' diplomatic ties with Asian nations and many of its European partners were shaken.

Mr. Chirac's decision apparently hinged on how much information the government's nuclear scientists gleaned from the latest blast, and whether they and the military could be satisfied with an early end.

"Thanks to the final series which has just been carried out, France will have at its disposal a viable and modern defense," Mr. Chirac said. "The security of our country and our children is assured."

The Defense Ministry said the final test, conducted Saturday beneath Fangataufa Atoll, about 750 miles southeast of Tahiti, had a force of 120 kilotons—the equivalent of 120,000 tons of TNT, six times more powerful than the first blast in the series.

Greenpeace and other environmental groups called the tests needless and dangerous to a region known for its crystal seas and rich marine life. Some reports have said the continued nuclear pounding cracked the atolls and could eventually release radioactivity, a contention the government vehemently denies.

Mr. Chirac announced last June that France would conduct up to eight such underground tests, then stop for good and sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Late last year, he said the tests would end by March and would number six or seven.

President Charles de Gaulle brought France into the atomic age in 1960. It stopped atmospheric testing in 1974 and bored the test tunnels beneath Mururoa and Fangataufa, where it has detonated 144 underground blasts.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1996]

#### FRANCE ENDING NUCLEAR TESTS THAT CAUSED BROAD PROTESTS

(By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, January 29.—The French Government said today that it had ended its nuclear weapons test program for good after conducting an underground blast in the South Pacific on Saturday, the last in a series of six such tests that were deplored by most of France's European allies and scores of other countries.

President Jacques Chirac announced the decision on national television this evening, calling the halt "the definitive end of French nuclear testing."

Mr. Chirac lifted a three-year moratorium on testing last year to try out a new warhead for French nuclear submarines and to gather data for computer simulations that will make future French nuclear weapons tests unnecessary.

French officials said today that the six tests carried out since last fall, which include the last and most powerful one under Fangataufa Atoll in the South Pacific on Saturday, had yielded enough data to make an additional test unnecessary.

They said that Mr. Chirac also wanted to put his best foot forward during a state visit to the United States this week and that he would use an address to Congress on Thursday to reaffirm France's intention to join the United States and other nuclear powers in signing a comprehensive test ban treaty this year to stop all further test explosions, no matter how small.

[In Washington, the Associated Press quoted the White House Press Secretary, Michael D. McCurry, as saying that that the French decision would "provide new momentum" to efforts to reach an international test ban treaty. The United States had pressed France to abide by the global moratorium.]

Mr. Chirac had said last June that the tests would end this spring but cut the number planned from eight to six after objections to the resumption of testing came from 10 of his 15 European Union allies, expressions of concern from the United States and vehement protests from Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and other Pacific countries.

"The possibility of rebuilding relationships with this part of the world, let alone New

Zealand, is going to be very, very difficult," New Zealand's Foreign Minister, Donald McKinnon, said today.

In an interview late last year, Mr. Chirac defended his decision to announce the resumption last June, not long before the 50th anniversary of the United States atom bomb attack on Hiroshima at the end of World War II.

"I didn't have any choice," he said. "To get the tests done in time to sign a comprehensive test ban treaty, preparations had to begin in the summer, and if we hadn't announced them, people would have discovered the work going on and accused us of being duplicitous."

French military experts told Mr. Chirac, a Gaullist conservative, that suspension of testing by his Socialist predecessor, François Mitterrand, had left a question mark over the reliability of the new TN-75 submarine-launched warhead and had also left France without sufficient data to future nuclear weapons testing to computer simulations.

Without assurance of reliability, the French independent nuclear deterrent would lack the credibility needed to scare off potential aggressors, the military said. Mr. Chirac was as determined as the late President Charles de Gaulle to enable France to take care of itself militarily, if necessary, without help from hands across the sea that could be withdrawn at any moment.

So he clenched his jaw while protesters poured Beaujolais down the drain and hanged him in effigy as "Hirochirac."

"I shared their concern," he said tonight, speaking from his office in Elysée Palace. "I know that nuclear tests can inspire fear." But, he continued, nuclear weapons served peace by deterring aggression.

It was to gather data necessary for simulation, authoritative French officials said, that the last explosion, equivalent to up to 120,000 tons of TNT and more than six times the size of the Hiroshima blast, was set off under Fangataufa Atoll on Saturday. Five other blasts were set off there and at nearby Mururoa Atoll, both in French Polynesia, between Sept. 5 and Dec. 27.

This brought to 198 the total number of French tests since the first one, which occurred in 1960 in the Sahara, in what was then French Algeria.

The end of French testing means that only China, among the admitted nuclear powers, is still carrying out underground explosions on its territory, though China's tests have not elicited nearly as much vehement protest as those of France. Tahitian protesters burned down the airport terminal at Papeete and caused \$40 million in damage in a riot after the first test in September, and the Greenpeace environmental pressure group sent protest ships into the test atoll.

France seized the Greenpeace ships and has refused to give them back, but Mr. Chirac was more irritated over the conduct of some of his European allies, including Italy, Sweden, Austria, and Finland, who voted at the United Nations in November to condemn French testing instead of abstaining as Germany, the United States, and many other countries did.

French officials, who had not consulted with their European allies about resuming the tests, canceled diplomatic meetings in anger. "It proves that there's a long way to go before Europe is built," Mr. Chirac said, but he thanked Britain, the only other European nuclear power, for never uttering a word of criticism about the French tests.

The French Defense Ministry has always insisted that the South Pacific tests caused no environmental damage, though it has conceded that trace amounts of radioactive iodine and other elements had been found in the waters around Mururoa after previous tests.

In a gesture to its European and NATO allies, France has offered recently to discuss ways of making its nuclear deterrent part of a stronger European defense pillar within the alliance, but concrete proposals are likely to be a long time coming, diplomats believe.●

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 104-99, which provided for the final disposition of Senate amendment number 115 to H.R. 1868 in both Houses, as if enacted into law, the Chair lays before the House the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1868, an act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

#### REMAKING AMERICA THE RIGHT WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the front-page article of the New York Times today, which talks about the CIA, has implications for the war to remake America that is going on in this Capitol now. Speaker GINGRICH has declared that politics is war without blood, and they have waged a relentless war.

My colleagues who spoke before about the threat of a default have indicated how serious this war is. The threat of a default is very serious. A default itself, of course, would be a disaster, but even a threat shakes the confidence of the world economies in this country and shakes the confidence of Americans.

Already the confidence of Americans has been shaken in their Government by two shutdowns of the Government. So I think it is very serious.

The following article that appears on the front page of the New York Times certainly has implications for what is going on with respect to streamlining and downsizing the expenditure side of the battle to remake America. It also has very serious implications with respect to the revenue side of the battle to remake America.

The New York Times article of today, January 30, says that a secret agency's secret budgets yield lost billions, officials say. Let me repeat that. A secret agency's secret budgets yield lost billions, officials say. Budgets, not just one budget. This secret agency has several budgets, and it has lost billions. The lost billions have been discovered, fortunately, at least as far as we know nothing has been stolen and whisked away from the American taxpayers, but it is there.

This \$2 billion slush fund, you know, with the Super Bowl for football over,